

REMARKS

I. Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-16 are rejected as being anticipated by Haas et al. (US 6,060,082). Haas is merely the prior art referenced in Fig. 1 of the present application.

The final office action characterizes the headspace insulator 70 as having a surface capable of acting as a receiving area. Additionally, the office action characterizes the chamber formed between the bottom surface of headspace insulator 70 and the upper surface of coil insulator 40 as being capable of serving as an indentation to lock the distal end of the feedthrough pin into the bottom surface of the headspace insulator 70. Further, the office action characterizes the lower portion of raised surface 72 as being an indentation.

The raised surface 72 is merely the top surface of headspace insulator 70. The feedthrough pin extends through aperture 76 and extends along the underside of headspace insulator 70. As Applicants can best understand the office action comments in referencing "lower portion," the comments must be referring to the bottom surface of headspace insulator 70. However, feedthrough pin is unsecured and freely "floats" within the chamber formed between the bottom surface of the headspace insulator 70 and the top surface of the coil insulator 40.

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the bottom surface of the headspace insulator has a recess receive a distal end of the feedthrough pin and a detent within the recess, which detent is configured to accept the distal end of the feedthrough pin and hold the distal end of the feedthrough pin in place with an interference fit when the distal end of the feedthrough pin is received into the recess. This further limitation of the headspace insulator structure clearly distinguishes from Haas despite the characterization placed on Haas by the final office action.

Applicants respectfully submit that the anticipation rejection of the claims based on Haas is now obviated and should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 is also rejected as being anticipated by Probst et al. (US 6,224,999). However, nowhere in the final office action is there an application of claim 1 to the disclosure in Probst. Without an indication as to how Probst is being characterized, Applicants cannot respond to the rejection. Applicants do submit, however, that Probst is without the combination of structural elements set forth in the limitations of amended claim 1.

II. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully assert that all the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the stated rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 13-2546.

Respectfully submitted,

May 21, 2007
Date

/Carol F. Barry/
Carol F. Barry
Reg. No. 41,600
(763) 514-4673
Customer No. 27581